Shall the Senate or the President Manage the Executive Department?

The Senate has passed a bill modifying the Tenure-of-Office law. The President is said to be satisfied with this compromise, although the essence of the law is still retained. The harsher restrictions and exactions of the law are cut off, but the power of the Senate over the President's removals is not relinquished. Hence we have still to ask the House, shall the Senate or the President manage the Executive Department?

This is a startling question. It suggests a change of the government by act of Congress. By act of Congress this change was made for the benefit of President Johnson. The power which all his predecessers had exercised in the matter of removals from office was in his case transferred to the Senate. Down to the passage of this law the President could and did remove his official subordinates at his discretion, the Senate being content with its constitutional power and duty of confirming or rejecting the President's nominations. But under this existing law the Senate has the decisive vote ever every removal from office. Thus the Executive Department has become a mere appendage of the Senate. The President is but the President in name, for practically his office is in the hands of an oligarchy—the oligarchy of the Senate. It so happens, too, that for the four years' term of General Grant as President the radical leaders of this oligarchy reasonably calculate upon controlling the Senate, and, through its action, the whole machinery and policy of the administration.

General Grant, with the quick perception of a sagacious soldier, on coming into power made the repeal of this Tenure-of-Office law the condition of anything like a general system of removals from office. He does not like the drudgery of submitting to the Senate his reasons for the removal of John Doe or Richard Roe, with the chances of having his reasons voted insufficient. But the radical majority of the Senate have so modified the law as to relieve him of this drudgery, requiring only that his removals in the absence of Congress shall be subject to the consent of the Senate at its next session. This is the substance of the law retained—the material feature which makes the President a mere servant of the Senate, though he may consent to it for the sake of peace. Let us suppose, for example, that this modification of the law is in force, and the two houses have adjourned over till December next. The President begins to weed out the fishy office-holders. A radical leader of the Senate, who has his friends to look after, takes the alarm. He ca is at the White House and says we think this man and that man ought not to be touched, but that such and such may be safely removed. What, then, is the President to do? Surely, his wisest course is to do nothing; and if left in this perplexing posture he ought to do nothing for the benefit of office-

beggars, great or small.

The Senate, having gained this position of the French Directory through the folly of the House of Representatives, is naturally enough disposed to keep it. The House, from its recent action on several occasions, is quite as anxious to rectify its mistake, under which a member of the House, as an office-seeker, is reduced to a mere nobody. But in refusing anything short of the absolute repeal of this Tenure of Office law, and in refusing to adjourn without this repeal, the House may regain its proper position of influence with the administration in enforcing upon the Senate a return to the Constitution on this subject and a compliance with the manifest will of the people. The law in question is an insult to the people and an insult to the House of Representatives from the degrading position to which the House is reduced, with the President, under this law. Nor can we expect any wholesome legislation from Congress so long as the House, the President, and the people are compelled, cap in hand, to bow to the supremacy of the

The framers of the Constitution, in classifying the Senate so that one-third of its members shall be elected with every new Congress, unquestionably had their fears that otherwise the Senate, with its members chosen for six years, might become a sort of oligarchy in the Government. But under existing circumstances, with this Tenure-of-Office law, we have this oligarchy established to a moral certainty for the next four years. Give it these four years, and it may become impossible to disturb this controlling aristocratic branch of Congress in the position it has secured. Nay, more, through its affiliation with banks, bondholders, office-holders, manufacturing monopolies, railways, whisky rings, and all other material agoncies of wealth and power, the will of the Senate may not only be the law of the President, but the law of the succession. Surely, with our experience in revolutionary changes during the last eight years, we cannot in our wildest conjectures undertake to cover the possibilities of the future.

In this experience we have learned practically, under the terrible array of an army of a million of men to begin with, that the reserved strength and sovereignty of our National Government are in Congress, but we have learned, too, that if we are safe against a despotism from the White House, we are in danger from an oligarchy in the Senate. Here lies the latent mischief of this Tenure-of-Office The executive supervision which it gives the Senate, even as modified, and the emptations which it covers for the spoils and plunder, wealth and power, are too large to be rusted or be trifled with in shallow compromises. This law should be utterly cut out of the statute book. It is not wanted. It is an unsightly excrescence in any shape. There are many reasons for its removal; but were there no other, the subordinate position to which it reduces the House of Representatives should suffice with that body for a firm de-mand for nothing less than absolute repeal.

Court Dress Reform.

When Lord Eldon was advanced to a judicial position requiring him to wear a wig of extraordinary proportions, poor Lady Eldon, who hated to have her dear John's handsome features hidden under a bushel of horse-hair, personally petitioned old George the Third to allow her husband to officiate in his own. "No, ne, no," answered the monarch; "no changes in my time—no changes in my time!" This conservative king, if now living, and in the possession of his wits, would probably be driven out of them, by certain changes which the Lord Chamberlain has ordained in the Court costame. Considering the interest taken heretofore by our own State Department in this matter, and which has led since Mr. Marcy's time to a voluminous correspondence on clothes, much of which has been printed, and remembering that the United States have been, to a considerable extent, the ploneers in this sartorial reform, we think that it would be a kind of

crowning glory with which Mr. Reverdy Johnson might illustrate his diplomatic career, if he would draw up an elaborate report on the whole subject of court-coats and court-breeches for the edification of the State Department aforesaid—a kind of final despatch upon the subject of garments!

day by the cable, that the Tories were paralyzed by the sense of the hopelessness of their position. Mr. Disraeli confined himself to a few general remarks in opposition to the principle of the bill, and all the other chief-tains, with the exception of Sir Stafford North-cote and Mr. Gathorne Hardy, were absolutely

The proposed changes in the court costume give occasion for a great deal of writing in the British newspapers. Such discussions may be taken to indicate at least an advanced stage of civilization. Certainly they could not have arisen at the primitive period mentioned by the amiable Cowper:—

"—when clothing samptuous or for use, Save their own unpainted skins, our sires had

Save their own unpainted skins, our sires had none.

As yet black breeches were not; satin smooth, Or veivet soft, or plush with shaggy pile."

Although a philosopher might view the whole matter with a certain degree of cool contempt, we are disposed to find in this apparently trivial affair an advance in the direction of democratic simplicity and common sense—not so well marked, indeed, as we might wish for, but still an advance. In the time of Louis XIV the tendency of any change would have been in precisely the opposite direction, and the minds of courtiers agitated and racked by inventions of splendor. The ready resource of a despot is to challenge the awe and admiration of those who do not come to court through the dazzling splendor of those who do. The pensions which he bestows upon his favorites, and which he knows will be expended in a display redounding to his own honor and glory, are, under the rule of an autocrat, the merely prudent investment of his surplus treasure.

Those, however, who have Quaker notions of simplicity of attire will not think that the Lord Chamberlain has done much more than abolish coats and breeches which the meddle-some caricaturists had already made laughable. People who approach her Majesty the Queen must still do so in a kind of uniform. Some of our readers may be interested to know that the new court suit is to be a "dark-colored cloth dress coat, with gold-embroidered collar, cuffs, and pocket-flaps, a white waistcoat, dark trousers of the same color as the coat, with a gold-lace stripe." The sword is to be fondly adhered to; the cocked hat is to be affectionally retained, and the beloved white neck-cloth by no means to be discarded. In a moment of misguided rapture we supposed that the breeches were gone forever, but we find that it is only at levee that the trowsers may be worn. At the drawing-room, breeches are still to flourish in all their primitive abbreviation; white or black silk stockings, shoes, and gilt buckles must still symbolize the awe with which Majesty is supposed to be approached.

to be approached. It is touching, however, to notice a tenderness, even while these rude innovations are officially permitted, for the feelings and prejudices of those who, having all their lives attended upon their sovereign in the discarded costume, might find themselves ill at ease in the new. Ancient persons, to whom a change might prove fatal, are permitted still to go to court, if they please, "in the gaise of Sir Anthony Absolute in the play." This concession having been made, we hope within a century at least another may be reasonably expected. Why, as the breeches are to be left to the discretion of the presented, are the "cocked-hat and sword" still considered to be indispensable? When every gentleman was expected to wear a sword whenever he went abroad, there was no absurdity in carrying that weapon upon the thigh; but the blade now is the distinctive mark of a soldier, and of a soldier upon service. Why require praceful people to put it on—staid country gentle-men who never set a squadron in a field, and city greeers who never served except in the militia? As for the cocked-hat, we do not know that we have anything to say. What are called reforms in hats seem to be merely and we begin to suspect that any covering for the head is incompatible with human dignity. Broad-brims, stove-pipes, wide-awakes, chim-ney-pots, fur hats, silk hats, high crowns, low crowns, hats of every hue and hats of every configuration, are all as absurd as swallow-tailed coats, and a great deal more uncomfortable. So far as appearances are concerned, we believe that anything hiding the brow and hair must necessarily be considered as covering something essential to the best appearance of a man. Any hat, after it has been a little while out of fashion, seems ridionlous. The ladies have pretty much given up bonnets, and the improvement in their appearance has been wonderful, although the gain is no doubt at the cost of health. But nobody seems capable of devising a hat which shall be at once warm, light, and elegant. Perhaps it is as well, therefore, to fall back upon the cocked-hat as being the oldest and the ngliest. We are sorry that poor Mr. Marcy is not here to enjoy the triumph of his republican views of the absurdity of court dresses. Poor Mr. Buchanan, too, if he were now in England, might go to court without having made himself the slave of the tailor. It is not likely that the strictest Secretary of State will quarrel with the new patterns at St. James'; and thus a fruitful source of irritation and

Mr. Gladstone's Victory.

correspondence is removed.

From the N. Y. Times. Mr. Gladstone has at length brought the first stage of his arduous task to a triumphant termination. His Irish Church bill was read a second time in the House of Commons on Tnesday night by the decisive vote of 368 to 250-the majority, 118, being identical in number with the full Liberal majority in the House. There are several seats vacant, and as there are always a good many "pairs" such occasions, it follows that the vote must have been very nearly a full one. There was no flinching on either side. The Tories fought their hopeless battle with sullen obstinacy, and without loss from desertion, and the Liberals proved true to a man to their hustings pledges; none of the "wak-kneed" members of the party, if such there be, made the cerof victory an excuse for absence, and the deafening cheers that burst forth at the close of their leader's final appeal showed that they were heart and soul in the cause, and not dragged unwillingly along by

The triumph is a signal one; and the fact that the success of the Liberals has been generally regarded as a matter of certainty for several menths should not be suffered to lead one to underestimate the importance of the victory they have now actually achieved. When Parliament met, the Tories were evidently not entirely destitute of hope. There might be disrensions in the Cabinet; Mr. Gladstone might bring forward an immature or impractical le measure; he might commit some rash indiscretion which would alienate a large portion of his party—such were the "things that might have been," out of which the Tories were then busily engaged in constructing castles in the air. It was not till the night of Mr. Gladstone's marvellous introductory speech, in which a grand and statesmanlike scheme, necessarily burdened with an almost unparalleled intricacy of detail, was laid by him before the House, without, as Mr. Disraeli himself confessed, "a single needless phrase," that hope deserted the breasts of his opponents. It is evident from the abstracts of the debate that have reached us from day to

day by the cable, that the Tories were paralyzed by the sense of the hopelessness of their position. Mr. Disraeli confined himself to a few general remarks in opposition to the principle of the bill, and all the other chieftains, with the exception of Sir Stafford Northcote and Mr. Gathorne Hardy, were absolutely silent. They dared not even take the aggressive by moving an abstract condemnatory resolution, or an amendment assailing the provisions or machinery of the bill. They sullenly divided against the second reading and met their fate in dignified silence.

Parliament has now adjourned until April

Parliament has now adjourned until April 3, when the struggle will be renewed in Committee of the Whole. The Tories may attempt, by continual harassing attacks on details, to drive the third reading so far into the session as to give the Lords an excuse for rejecting it on the ground of insufficiency of time for discussion. But we doubt if such tactics could prove successful, and we are certain that those interested in the temporalities of the Irish Church can never expect again to get such good terms as those offered them in Mr. Gladstone's admirably-designed and equitable measure. If they succeed in postponing a settlement for another year, so much the worse for them. We are inclined to fancy that both they and their political leaders will see this, and that the bill will be suffered to become a law with little further opposition than a series of formal registrations of protests by its opponents.

The New Tenure-of-Office Bill.

From the N. Y. World. It the substitute for the Tenure-of-Office bill reported by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, and carred through that bedy by a vote of 37 to 15 on Wednesday, should become a law, President Grant will be outwitted and circumvented. The difficulty, on his side, lies in the fact that he is pursuing an object which it would be an indecorum in him to avow. The reasons for repeal which he has put forth are only pretexts. The Senate bill is admirably adapted to meet those sham reasons, and at the same to frustrate his real object. What General Grant wants is the absolute power of removal, to be held in reserve as a means of forcing his renomination by the Republican party in 1872. This is a motive which he cannot confess. In insisting on the repeal of the law, he has affected an unwillingness to make suspensions for which he would be compelled to assign reasons. In many cases he could give no reasons supported by tenable proofs, although convinced in his own mind that the officer was dishonest or incompetent. He has pretended, in conversation, that he was unwilling to subject himself to the mortification of suspending officers on mere suspicion, and yet be compelled to make charges when he had none to make resting on positive evidence. The Senate, in the absence of tangible proofs, would be likely to overrule him; and he does not wish to incur the mortification of trump ing up charges which he cannot sustain. He has insisted on the right of removal upon his own opinion of the unfliness of the officer, as the only way to reach rogues cunning enough to furnish no handle for specific, circumstantial charges, and incapables whose inefficiency is not so glaring that he can make out a strong case against them. To gain this power, he has insisted on an absolute repeal of the law; on a restoration of the authority exercised by his predecessors for three-quarters of a cen-

The Senate, with consummate craft, has devised a bill which meets his alleged reasons, but, at the same time, thwarts his real objects. He has asked exemption from the necessity of preferring charges against officers whom he wishes to displace; and the new bill exempts him from preferring charges, but leaves him as powerless to make absolute removals as he is under the present law. It is said that the Senators have even proposed to practise a refinement of satirical courtesy, by conferring with the President and asking him to point out in what respect, if any, he deems the new bill unsatisfactory. As his alleged oblection to the present law has been obviated, and as he dare not state where it really pinches, the proposed consultation is an ironical mockery of his motives.

By the new bill, the President can suspend officers, but not remove them. If the Senate does not sanction his suspensions, the sus-pended officers are entitled to resume their places at the end of the next session of the Senate, and proceed to perform their duties as if nothing had happened. According to former practice under the Constitution, before the Tenure-of-Office bill was passed, the re-movals made by the President were absolute and final. Although the Senate might refuse to confirm successors, its refusal did not re-store the ousted officers. Once put out by the Presidential flat, they could never get back. If their temporary successors were not confirmed, the consequence was simply a new vacancy en the adjournment of the Senate, which vacancy the President could again fill by new temporary appointments. These held good until the close of the next session of the Senate, and so on until the end of the Presidential term, unless the Senate saw fit to confirm the President's appointments. But under the new bill every officer has a reversionary interest in his office, which falls back to him as soon as the Senate adjourn, unless that body either cenfirms his successor or approves of his suspension. The power of the President will be just as much circumscribed as it is under the present Tenure-of-Office act. He can, indeed, suspend without preferring any charges; but, on the other hand, the Senate can reinstate the officer without passing upon the validity of any charges. The Senate is to be just as free to act on its own mere pleasure in re-storing an officer, as the President is to act on his mere pleasure in suspending him. Under the present Tenure-of-Office act, the Senate is obliged to consider and pass upon the President's charges against an officer. It must decide that they are insufficient, or he cannot be restored. Under the new bill the officer will be restored by the mere omission of the Senate to act. The thing is just as long as it is broad. No charges are to be made on the one side; none are to be considered on the other. The President can suspend officers by his mere will; the Senate can restore them by its mere will, and even by its mere inaction. The President, therefore, can displace no officer except for a brief period. He can displace no officer at all, except in a

Now let us consider what the bearing of this new bill will be on the object which General Grant has chiefly at heart—the power to wield the Federal patronage to pack a national convention and force his renomination. Suspensions from office in the summer and fall of 1871 would avail him nothing, as he would have no power to keep the suspended officers out, or their temporary successors in, up to the meeting of the Republican National Convention. If he attempted to pack the convention by his new appointees, Congress might adjourn before the convention met, and their displaced predecessors would all be restored. If he retrained from making suspensions, and attempted to pack the convention by operating on the fears of the incumbents, the attempt would be equally futile. Congress will meet the first of December, 1871, and General Grant can make ne suspensions while it is in session. The nominating con-

vention could be appointed to meet before the adjournment, and after General Grant had been supplanted by a rival, his power of suspension could not help him. It is clear, therefore, that the new bill is no more favorable to his nitimate but unavowed object, than is the Tenure-of-Office act on whose repeal he has so stiffly insisted.

FINANCIAL.

Union Pacific Railroad

1040 MILES

NOW COMPLETED.

The First Mertgage Bonds,

HAVING SO YEARS TO RUN,

Principal and Interest Payable in Gold,

WE ARE NOW SELLING

AT

PAR AND INTEREST,

Or exchanging for GOVERNMENT SECURI TIES on the following terms:—

wm. PAINTER & CO.

BANKERS AND DEALERS IN GOVERN

MENTS, GOLD, ETC., No. 36 South THIRD Street.

2 19

CLARK&

No. 35 SOUTH THIRD STREET,
PHILADELPHIA.

COVERNMENT SECURITYES

COVERNMENT SECURITIES, STOCK, COLD AND NOTE BROKERS.

GENERAL AGENTS,

SOUTHERN NEW JERSEN.
OF THE OF THE NOTATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE CO.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

The National Life Insurance Company is a corporation chartered by special Act of Congress, approved July 25, 1868, with a

CASH CAPITAL, \$1,000,000, FULL PAID.

Liberal terms offered to Agents and Solicitors, who are invited to apply at our office.

Full particulars to be had on application at our office, located in the second story of our Banking House, where Circulars and Pamphiets, fully describing the dvantages offered by the Company, may be had.

E. W. CLARK & CO...

No. 35 South Third St.

P. S. PETERSON & CO., Stock and Exchange Brokers, No. 39 South THIRD Street,

Members of the New York and Philadele

STOCKS, BONDS, Etc., bought and sold on commission only at either city. 1262

GROCERIES, ETC.

FRESH FRUIT IN CANS.
PEACHES, PINEAPPLES, ETC.,
GRBEN CORN. TOMATOES.
FRENCH PEAS, MUSHROOMS,
ASPARAGUS. ETC. ETC.
ALBERT C. ROBERTS.

Desier in Fine Groceries,
Il 7frp Cor. ELEVENTH and VINE Streets.

PROVISIONS, ETC.

MICHAEL MEAGHER & CO., No. 223 South SIXTEENTH Street, WHOLESALE AND BETAIL DEALERS IN

OYSTERN, AND SAND CLAMS, FOR FAMILY USE. TERNAPISS SIG PER DOZEN.

WOODLANDS CEMETERY COMPANY,—
elected for the year 18-25.—
ELI K. PRICE. President.
Wm. H. Moore,
Bamuel S. Moon,
Gilles Dalleit,
Bedwin Greble,
Becostary and Treasurer, JOSEPH H. TOWNSEND.
The Managers have passed a resolution requiring both Lot-holders and Visitors to present tickets at the entrysee for admission to the Cemetery. Tickets may be had at the Office of the Company, No. 813
ARC of Street, or of any of the Managers.

DR. P. GIRARD, VETERINARY SURGEON, treats all discesses of horses and cotlie, and all surgical operations, with efficient accounmodations for horses at his Infirmary, No. 990
MARHHAIL Bures, above Popias

FINANCIAL.

UNION PACIFIC

RAILROAD

FIRST MORTGAGE

30 YEARS SIX PER CENT.

COLD BONDS,

FOR SALE AT PAR

AND

ACCRUED INTEREST.

DEHAVEN&BRO.

DEALERS IN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES, GOLD, ETC.,

No. 40 South THIRD Street,

I ti PHILADELPHIA.

JAY COOKE & CO.

Nos. 112 and 114 South THIRD Stree

PHILADELPHIA,

Old 5-20s Wanted in Exchange for New
A Liberal Difference allowed.
Compound Interest Notes Wanted.
Interest Allowed on Deposits.

COLLECTIONS MADE. STOCKS bought and sold on Commission.

Special business accommodations reserved tadies;

We will receive applications for Policies of L Insurance in the National Life Insurance Company of the United States. Full information given at ou office. 118m

LEDYARD & BARLOW

Have Removed their

LAW AND COLLECTION OFFICE

No. 19 South THIRD Street.

PHILADELPHIA.

And will continue to give careful attention to collecting and securing CLAIMS throughout the United States, British Provinces, and Eu

Sight Drafts and Maturing Paper collected at

GLENDINNING, DAVIS & CO

No. 48 South THIRD Street,

PHILADELPHIA:

GLENDINNING, DAVIS & AMORY
No. 2 NASSAU St., New York,
BANKERS AND BROKERS.

Direct telegraphic communication with the New York Stock Boards from the Philadelphia Office. 12

BKJAMISON & Co.

SUCCESSORS TO

P. F. KELLY & CO.,
BANKERS AND DEALERS IN

Gold, Silver, and Government Bonds,

N. W. Corner THIRD and CHESNUT Sts.

Special attention given to COMMISSION ORDERS
in New York and Philadelphia Stocks Boards, etc.

CHITH CANDOLPH& BANKERS A PHILES NOORK

Dealers in United States Bonds, and Members of Stock and Gold Exchange,
Receive Accounts of Banks and Bankers on
Liberal Terms,
ISSUE BILLS OF EXCHANGE ON
C. J. HAMBEO & SON, LONDON,
B. METZLER, S. SOHN & CO., FRANKFORT
JAMES W. TUCKER & CO., PARIS,
And Other Principal Cities, and Letters of
Credit Available Throughout Europe.

CHAMPION SAFES!

PRILADELPHIA, January 18, 1869.

No. 629 Chesnut street.
Gentlemen:—On the night of the 13th inst., as is well known to the citizens of Philadelphis, our large and extensive store and valuable stock of merchandise, No. 602 Chesnut street was burned.

The fire was one of the most extensive and destructive that has visited our city for many years, the heat being so intense that even the marble cornice was almost obliterated.

We had, as you are aware, two of your vainable and well-known CHAMPION FIRE-PROOF SAFES; and nobly have they vindicated your well-known reputation as masufacturers of FIRE-PROOF SAFES, if suyfurther proof had been required.

They were subjected to the most interive heat, and it affords us much pleasure to inform you that after recovering them from the ruins, we found upon examination that our books, papers, and other valuables, were all in perfect condition.

Yours, very respectfully, JAS. E. CALDWELL & CO.

THE ONLY SAFES EXPOSED TO THE FIRE IN CALDWELL'S STORE WERE FARREL, HERRING & CO.

PHILADELPHIA, Jan. 18, 1889.
Messre. FARREL, HERRING & CO.,

No. 629 Chesnut street, Gentiemen:—On the night of the i3th instant our large store, S. W. corner of Ninth and Chesnut streets, was, together with our heavy stock of wall papers, entirely destroyed by fire.

We had one of your PATENT CHAMPION FIRE-PROOF SAFES, which contained our principal books and papers, and although it was exposed to the most intense heat for over 60 hours, we are happy to say it proved itself worthy of our recommendation. Our books and papers were all preserved. We cheerfully tender our testimonial to the many already published, in giving the HERRING SAFE the credit and confidence it justly merits.

Yours, very respectfully, HOWELL & BROTHERS.

STILL ANOTHER.
PHILADELPHIA, Jan. 19, 1889.
Messrs. FARREL, HERRING & CO.,

No. 629 Cheenut street.

Gentlemen:—I had one of your make of safes in the basement of J. E. Caldwell & Co.'s store at the time of the great fire on the night of the 13th instant. It was removed from the ruins to-day, and on opening it I found all my books, papers, green-backs, watches, and waten materials, etc., ail preserved. I feel glad that I had one of your truly valuable safes, and shall want another of your make when I get located.

Yours, very respectfully,

F. L. KIRKPATRICK,
with J. E. Caldwell & Co.,
No. 819 Chesnut street.

FARREL, HERRING & CO.

CHAMPION SAFES,

No. 629 CHESNUT Street,

GREAT BARGAINS

IN SAFES.

IN CONSEQUENCE OF ILL HEALTH I WILL BELL MY STOCK OF

S A F E S, E T C., With Two Years' Unexpired Lease of Store, No. 639 ARCH Street,

AND TWO VERY SUPERIOR DRAUGHT HOESES, WAGON, ETC, for cash or in exchange for desirable property.

Parties wishing to make such purchase will please call at my store betw.en ten and unree o'clock.

SAFES SELLING AT GREATLY REDUCED PRICES.

39 tuthsim M. C. SADLER, Agent.

FIRE AND BURGLAR-PROOF SAFES,
LOOKSMITH, RULL-HANGER, AND DRALES
IN RULLDING HARDWARE.

CLOTHS, CASSIMERES, ETC.

JAMES & LEE

Sign of the Golden Lamb,

Are now receiving an ENTIRE NEW STOCK or Spring and Summer Coatings,

To which they invite the attention of the trade and others, (3 25 w

WIRE GUARDS,

Patent Wire Railing, Iron Bedsteads, Ornamental Wire Work, Paper-makers' Wires, and every variety of Wire Work, manufactured by M. WALKER & SONS.

LARZELERE & BUCHEY,
Custom House Brokers and Notaries Public,
Mo. 405 LIBRARY Street.
All Custom House Business transacted.
PASSPORTS PROCURED: